

REMARKS

The office action issued by the Examiner and the citations referred to in the office action have been carefully considered.

Claims 29, 30, and 38 are amended. Claims 51-63 are newly added. Claims 31-37 and 39-51 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 29-30, 38, and 52-63 are pending with this response.

Drawings

Figure 11 is newly added as suggested in the Office Action. No new matter is introduced by the addition of this figure.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 29, 30, and 38 have been amended to ensure there is proper antecedent basis for all the terms in the claims. Claims 31-37 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,158,493 to Morgrey. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,317,652 to Osada.

Both prior art references disclose a two-legged walking robot.

However the claims of the present application are directed to coordinating the movements of a legged figure with the motion caused by a separate drive mechanism which is coupled to the legged figure.

Independent claim 29 is directed to controlling the movement of a legged figure coupled to a drive mechanism, whereby the entire legged figure is moved by the drive mechanism, and coordinating the leg movement of the figure to the movement of the entire figure as caused by the drive mechanism.

Newly added independent claim 59 specifies that the legged figure is coupled to a wheeled support, which is propelled by a drive mechanism. Neither of the prior art references teach or suggest a legged figure which is coupled to a wheeled support, being propelled by a drive mechanism. Furthermore, claim 59 is directed to moving the wheeled support, and synchronizing the walking movement of the wheeled support, as determined by the drive mechanism, to the wheeled support.

Neither of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest synchronizing the movement of a legged figure to that of a separate drive mechanism coupled to the legged figure.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 29, 30, 38, and 52-64 are allowable in view of the prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account Number 50-2638**. Please ensure that Attorney Docket Number 54317-025101 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,


Margo Maddux
Reg. No. 50,962

Date: August 28, 2006

Customer Number 46560
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (310) 586-7700
Fax: (310) 586-7800
email: laipmail@gtlaw.com
LA 126605494v1